1 2 3 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 5 6 ROBERT H. BROWN, D-52029, 7 Petitioner, No. C 09-1286 CRB (PR) 8 ORDER REQUESTING VS. SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING 9 ROBERT K. WONG, Acting Warden, 10 Respondent. 11 12 13 A recent en banc decision from the Ninth Circuit addressed important issues 14 relating to federal review of parole decisions in California. See Hayward v. Marshall, 15 No. 06-55392, 2010 WL 1664977 (9th Cir. April 22, 2010) (en banc). The court 16 requests that the parties submit supplemental briefs (not to exceed 12 pages in length) 17 explaining their views on how the <u>Hayward</u> en banc decision applies to this parole 18 denial habeas case. The court sets the following schedule: 19 1. Within 10 days of this order, respondent shall send to petitioner a copy 20 of the Hayward decision. 21 2. Within 30 days of this order, respondent shall file with the court and 22 serve on petitioner a supplemental brief on the impact of <u>Hayward</u> on this action. 23 3. Within 15 days thereafter, petitioner may file with the court and serve on 24 respondent a supplemental brief on the impact of <u>Hayward</u> on this action. 25 SO ORDERED. 26 DATED: April 30, 2010 27 United States District Judge 28 G:\PRO-SE\CRB\HC.09\Brown, R1.or1.wpd